



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/458,820	12/13/1999	WUPING DONG	FUJI-111	9320
30074	7590	10/04/2006	EXAMINER	
TAFT, STETTINIUS & HOLLISTER LLP SUITE 1800 425 WALNUT STREET CINCINNATI, OH 45202-3957			PASS, NATALIE	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		3626		
DATE MAILED: 10/04/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/458,820	DONG, WUPING	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Natalie A. Pass	3626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 May 2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant

1. This communication is in response to the Appeal Brief filed 31 May 2006. Claims 1-6 remain pending.
2. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 31 May 2006, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new ground of rejection is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

- (1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,
- (2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2, 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schoolery et al., (U.S. Patent 5, 570,283), in view of article, "The Impact of Electronic Commerce on the Travel Industry" June 1996. URL:

<<http://groups.haas.berkeley.edu/citm/publications/papers/wp-1017.html>>, hereinafter known as Bloch, Rangan (U.S. Patent 6,412, 073), Garback (U.S. Patent 5,237,499), and Vance et al., (U.S. Patent 6, 442,526).

(A) As per claim 1, Schoolery teaches a booking and issuing method of an intranet ticket booking and issuing system including a net server and an issuing terminal interconnected to said net server via a local area network, said issuing terminal being interconnected to external reservation systems which accept ticket booking requests via at least one communication line, and a personal computer being interconnected to said net server via said local area network and having an internet connection function, comprising

 a booking step for making a booking from said personal computer to one of said external reservation systems (Schoolery; column 5, line 60 to column 6, line 2), said booking step including:

 addressing a user's ticket booking commencement request to said local computer from said personal computer (Schoolery; column 6, lines 31-66).

 Schoolery fails to explicitly disclose
 sending home page addresses of said external reservation systems from said local computer to said personal computer via said local area network in accordance with said ticket booking commencement request.

However, the above features are well-known in the art, as evidenced by Bloch.

In particular, Bloch teaches

sending home page addresses of said external reservation systems from said local computer to said personal computer via said local area network in accordance with said ticket booking commencement request. (Bloch; page 7, paragraphs 8-10); Examiner interprets Bloch's teachings of "travel integrators who will understand customer needs, select the right information on the Web for them, package and present it attractively" (Bloch; page 7, paragraph 9) in order to allow for "direct customer access" (Bloch; page 7, paragraph 10) as a form of "sending home page addresses...";

generating, in said personal computer, booking data of a predetermined format, the booking data of the predetermined format including the booking number (Bloch; page 6, paragraph 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Schoolery to include these strategic corporate travel management limitations, as taught by Bloch, with the motivations of enabling businesses to get more control of their travel expenses for corporate travel and enforcing corporate-wide travel policies while respecting every traveler's preferences (Bloch; page 6, paragraph 1).

Schoolery fails to explicitly disclose storing in said personal computer the home page addresses sent from said net server into a memory and displaying information corresponding to the home page addresses relating to said external reservation systems on a screen for selection by the user;

receiving, in said personal computer, a selection of one of said external reservation systems by the user and reading out the home page address of the selected external reservation system from said memory.

However, the above features are well-known in the art, as evidenced by Rangan.

In particular, Rangan teaches

storing in said personal computer the home page addresses sent from said net server into a memory and displaying information corresponding to the home page addresses relating to said external reservation systems on a screen for selection by the user (Rangan; Figure 2, Figure 3, Abstract, column 2, lines 10-20, column 4, lines 52-60, column 5, lines 35-44);

receiving, in said personal computer, a selection of one of said external reservation systems by the user and reading out the URL (reads on “home page address”) of the selected external reservation system from said memory (Rangan; Figure 2, Figure 3, Abstract, column 2, lines 10-20, column 4, lines 52-60, column 5, lines 35-44).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined applied references to include these limitations, as taught by Rangan, with the motivations of providing an interactive Internet portal that will enable users to accomplish pre-defined tasks such as navigation and interaction between web servers based on user pre-programming (user profiles) and of allowing a subscriber to safely and securely navigate to any of multiple destinations on the Internet with a single point-and-click and in this way greatly simplify on-line or network-based business transactions (Rangan; column 2, lines 1-7, column 3, lines 30-40).

Schoolery fails to explicitly disclose connecting said personal computer to a website of the selected external reservation system via the Internet and displaying a reservation screen of a web site of the selected external reservation system;

completing a booking through the website, between said personal computer and the selected external reservation system, by transmitting and receiving information data, including a booking number without the aid of said net server via the Internet; and compiling predetermined data included in the information data and sending the booking data of the predetermined format to said net server via said local network;

an issuance step for issuing a booked ticket by said issuing terminal, said issuance step including:

receiving in said net server, the booking data of the predetermined format; transmitting said booking number from said issuing terminal to the selected external reservation system via said at least one communication line.

However, the above features are well-known in the art, as evidenced by Garback.

In particular, Garback teaches

connecting said personal computer to an airline reservation system accessed with a modem over a wide area network (reads on "website of the selected external reservation system") via a wide area network (reads on "the Internet") and "the central processing unit is in communication with the various airline CRS [computerized reservation] systems" and "the central processing unit is further programmed to display the selected flights ... to the individual ...via the display means of the terminal 22" (reads on "displaying a reservation screen of the web

site of the selected external reservation system") (Garback; see at least Figure 2, column 2, lines 54-63, column 3, lines 17-42, column 4, lines 33-41, column 4, line 63 to column 5, line 40, column 5, lines 57-61);

completing a booking through the website, between said personal computer and the selected external reservation system, by transmitting and receiving information data, without the aid of said net server via the Internet (Garback; see at least Figure 2, column 2, lines 54-63, column 3, lines 17-52, column 4, lines 33-41, column 4, line 63 to column 5, line 40, column 5, line 57 to column 6, line 10);

compiling predetermined data included in the information data and sending the booking data of the predetermined format to said net server via said local network (Garback; Figure 1, Figure 2E, Figure 4, column 3, lines 5-10, column 5, line 56 to column 6, line 10, column 6, lines 27-40, column 6, line 62 to column 7, line 30);

an issuance step printing (reads on issuing) a booked ticket by said issuing terminal, said issuance step including:

receiving in said net server, a confirmation message (reads on the "booking data of the predetermined format") (Garback; Figure 1, Figure 2E, Figure 4, column 3, lines 5-10, column 5, line 56 to column 6, line 10, column 6, lines 27-40, column 6, line 62 to column 7, line 30);

transmitting ticketing information including the "confirmation number" (reads on "booking number") from said issuing terminal to the selected external reservation system via said at least one communication line (Garback; Figure 1, Figure 2E, Figure 4, column 3, lines 5-10, column 5, line 56 to column 6, line 10, column 6, lines 27-40, column 6, line 62 to column 7, line 30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined cited references to include the above limitations, as taught by Garback, with the motivations of providing a computer based travel planning system which allows an individual business traveler to efficiently and effectively book an itinerary for a specified venue, such as an upcoming meeting or seminar and in addition which conforms with a preset travel policy prenegotiated by a sponsoring organization and to do so in a fraction of the time previously required to book a business reservation, thus significantly lowering the cost of corporate travel (Garback; column 2, lines 9-16, column 3, lines 47-52).

Schoology fails to explicitly disclose
storing a received booking data in said net server, and sending said booking number included in the received booking data to said issuing terminal from said net server; and
receiving, in said issuing terminal, ticket issuing data from the selected external reservation system to issue the ticket.

However, the above features are well-known in the art, as evidenced by Vance.
In particular, Vance teaches
storing a received booking data in said net server, and sending “pre-trip booking data” (reads on “said booking number included in the received booking data”) to said issuing terminal from said net server (Vance; Figure 1, Figure 14U, column 4, lines 1-37); and
receiving, in said issuing terminal, ticket issuing data from the selected external reservation system to issue the ticket (Vance; Figure 1, Figure 14U, column 4, lines 1-37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined applied references to include these limitations, as taught by Vance, with the motivations of providing a corporate travel planning and management system which operates on a corporate database environment that allows automated travel planning from a corporate traveler's desktop, pre-travel decision support to inform a corporation of planned travel expenditures before corporate dollars are spent (Vance; column 2, lines 36-42).

(B) Claim 2 differs from claim 1 in that claim 1 contains a method recited as a series of function steps whereas claim 2 contains features recited in a "means-plus-function" format. As the limitations of claim 1 have been shown to be obvious in view of the combined teachings of Schoolery, Bloch, Rangan, Garback, and Vance, it is readily apparent that the "means" to accomplish those method steps is obvious in view of the listed citations of the prior art. As such, the limitations recited in claim 2 are rejected for the same reasons given above for claim 1, and incorporated herein.

The motivations for combining the respective teachings of Schoolery, Bloch, Rangan, Garback, and Vance are as given in the rejection of claim 1 above and incorporated herein.

(C) As per claims 5-6, Schoolery, Bloch, Rangan, Garback, and Vance teach a method and system as analyzed and discussed in claims 1-2 above further comprising: a step of receiving instructions for the predetermined data format (Garback; Figure 1, Figure 2E, Figure 4, column 3, lines 5-10, column 5, line 56 to column 6, line 10, column 6, lines 27-40, column 6, line 62 to column 7, line 30),

wherein the generating step generates, in response to the instructions, booking data of a common data-format using data displayed on the reservation screen of the selected external reservation system and sends the booking data of the common data-format to said net server via said local area network, the common data-format being a data-format common to computers connected to said local area network (Garback; see at least Figure 2, column 2, lines 54-63, column 3, lines 17-42, column 4, lines 33-41, column 4, line 63 to column 5, line 40, column 5, line 56 to column 6, line 40, column 6, line 62 to column 7, line 30).

The motivations for combining the respective teachings of Schoolery, Bloch, Rangan, Garback, and Vance are as given in the rejection of claim 1 above and incorporated herein.

5. Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schoolery et al., (U.S. Patent 5, 570,283), in view of article, "The Impact of Electronic Commerce on the Travel Industry" June 1996. URL:

<<http://groups.haas.berkeley.edu/citm/publications/papers/wp-1017.html>>, hereinafter known as Bloch, Rangan (U.S. Patent 6,412, 073), Garback (U.S. Patent 5,237,499), and Vance et al., (U.S. Patent 6, 442,526), as applied to claims 1 and 2 above, and further in view of Tagawa (5,732, 398).

(A) As per claim 3, Schoolery, Bloch, Rangan, Garback, and Vance teach a booking and issuing method as analyzed and discussed in claim 1 above.

Schoolery, Bloch, Rangan, Garback, and Vance fail to explicitly disclose converting, in said local computer, the booking data received from said personal computer into data of a predetermined hypertext or Internet language to generate data for fare adjustment; and storing the data for fare adjustment in said local computer.

However, the above features are well-known in the art, as evidenced by Tagawa.

In particular, Tagawa teaches

converting, in said local computer, the booking data received from said personal computer into data of a predetermined hypertext or Internet language to generate data for fare adjustment (Tagawa; see at least Figure 2b, Item 108, Figure 9B, Item 524, column 5, lines 6-27, column 9, lines 34-38, 59-64, column 18, line 46 to column 19, line 4); and storing the data for fare adjustment in said local computer (Tagawa; see at least Figure 2b, Item 108, Figure 9B, Item 524, column 5, lines 6-27, column 9, lines 34-38, 59-64, column 18, line 46 to column 19, line 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Schoolery, Bloch, Rangan, Garback, and Vance to include converting, in said local computer, the booking data received from said personal computer into data of a predetermined hypertext or Internet language to generate data for fare adjustment; and storing the data for fare adjustment in said local computer, as taught by Tagawa, with the motivations of reducing the labor costs associated with the sale of travel-related services by providing an interactive electronic travel-related service system for selling travel-related services and products where the system can function like a travel agent and where various purchases and

reservations are made through the Internet (Tagawa; column 1, lines 16-21, column 2, lines 33-37, column 3, lines 1-4, column 9, lines 62-64).

(B) As per claim 4, the limitations in claim 4 differ from the limitations in claim 3 in that, claim 3 contains a method recited as a series of function steps whereas claim 4 recites system elements. As the method of claim 3 has been shown to be disclosed or obvious in view of the combined teachings of Schoolery, Bloch, Rangan, Garback, and Vance, it is readily apparent that the system to accomplish those method steps is obvious in view of the listed citations of the prior art. As such, the limitations recited in claim 4 are rejected for the same reasons given above for method claim 3, and incorporated herein.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 31 May 2006 have been fully considered but they are. moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure. The cited but not applied references Bingham, United States Patent Number 6, 324, 517, Robertson, United States Patent Number 6, 269, 369, Baker III, United States Patent Number 6, 266, 648, Lynch, et al., United States Patent Number 6, 018, 715, and Zompa, et al., United States Patent 6, 937, 991 teach the environment of online travel reservation systems.

8. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington D.C. 20231

or faxed to: **(571) 273-8300.**

For informal or draft communications, please label
“PROPOSED” or “DRAFT” on the front page of the communication
and do NOT sign the communication.

After Final communications should be labeled "Box AF."

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Natalie A. Pass whose telephone number is (571) 272-6774. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 9:00 AM to 6:30 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

10. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas, can be reached at (571) 272-6776. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-3600.

11. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

NP
Natalie A. Pass

August 7, 2006

Joseph Thomas
JOSEPH THOMAS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER